

SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

**NOTICE OF
FORTHCOMING FILING**

The Supreme Court has indicated that the filing of a written opinion in the following case(s) is forthcoming. At the filing time designated below, the filed opinion(s) will be accessible at the judicial branch web site (www.courtinfo.ca.gov) and copies will be made available at the Supreme Court Clerk's Office.

[Generally, the description set out with regard to each case is reproduced from the original news release issued when review in the matter was granted, and is provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The description does not necessarily reflect the view of the court, or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.]

COSTCO WHOLESALE CORP. v. SUPERIOR COURT (RANDALL ET AL., RPI)

S163335 (B197692; Los Angeles County Superior Court – BC29636)

Argued in San Francisco 9-02-09

This case presents the following issues: (1) Does the attorney-client privilege (Evid. Code, § 954) protect factual statements that outside counsel conveys to corporate counsel in a legal opinion letter? (2) Does Evidence Code section 915 prohibit a trial court from conducting an in camera review of a legal opinion letter to determine whether the attorney-client privilege protects facts stated in the letter?

ROBY (CHARLENE) v. McKESSON CORPORATION ETAL.

S149752 (C047617/C048799; Yolo County Superior Court – CV01573)

Argued in San Francisco 9-02-09

This case presents the following issues: (1) In an action for employment discrimination and harassment by hostile work environment, does *Reno v. Baird* (1998) 18 Cal.4th 640, require that the claim for harassment be established entirely by reference to a supervisor's acts that have no connection with matters of business and personnel management, or may such management-related acts be considered as part of the totality of the circumstances allegedly creating a hostile work environment? (2) May an appellate court determine the maximum constitutionally permissible award of punitive damages when it has reduced the accompanying award of compensatory damages, or should the court remand for a new determination of punitive damages in light of the reduced award of compensatory damages?

Opinion(s) in the above case(s) will be filed on:

Monday, November 30, 2009 at 10:00 a.m.
